PTO/SB/21 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

MDEMARK	Application Number	10/718,906 November 21, 2003 Cable, Kevin		
TRANSMITTAL	Filing Date			
FORM	First Named Inventor			
	Art Unit	1773		
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing	Examiner Name	Donald L. Tarzano		
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	Attorney Docket Number	BRP-56-RCE		
	ENCLOSURES (Check all)	that apply)		
Fee Transmittal Form	Drawing(s)	After Allowance communication to (TC)		
☐ Fac Attached	Licensing related Banara	Appeal Communication to Board of		

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)						
Fee Transmitta	al Form	Drawing(s)		After A	llowance communication to (TC)	
Fee Atta	ached	Licensing-related Papers			Communication to Board of s and Interferences	
x Amendment / I	Reply	Petition		Appea	Il Communication to TC	
After Fin	nal	Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application		Propri	etary Information	
Affidavit	s/declaration(s)	Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address		Status	Letter	
Extension of Ti	ime Request	Terminal Disclaimer	×	Other below)	Enclosure(s) (please identify :	
Express Aband	Ionment Request	Request for Refund	Retur	n Rece	ipt Postcard	
Information Disc	dosure Statement	CD, Number of CD(s)	:			
Certified Copy	of Priority	Landscape Table on CD				
Document(s) Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53						
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT						
Firm Name J. B	ennett Mullinax, LLC					
Signature 9-B-Million						
Printed name J. B	Bennett Mullinax					
Date Apr	il 1, 2005		leg. No.	36221		
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING						
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.						
Signature						
Typed or printed name Peoply S. Baken				Date	April 1, 2005	

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.





PATENT

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: BRP-56-RCE

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Applicatio	on of: Kevin Cable)	Examiner: Donald L. Tarzano
S/N: 10/718,	906)	Art Unit: 1773
Filed: 11/21/20	003)	Conf. No.: 1643
Title: Improve	d Flavor Barrier)	

SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDMENT & INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P O Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Interview Summary dated 09 March 2005, Applicant responds as follows.

Statement Regarding Interview

Applicant acknowledges the courtesies extended by the Examiner in the interview of 09 March 2005. Applicant failed to note that the Interview Summary indicated a telephonic interview. Applicant respectfully submits that it was a personal interview between the Examiner and the Applicant's undersigned representative.

The art of record was discussed at the interview and the amendment accompanying the RCE filed on February 28, 2005, was discussed. The Examiner indicated that the inclusion of actual percentages in the independent claims helped distinguish over the prior art.

With respect to claim 21, it was discussed including an anti-scalping layer containing actual percentages of the inorganic additive similarly as was done in independent claims 1 and 19.

10/718,906

With respect to claim 20, it was discussed that the additional layer set forth in claim 20 is a separate layer applied directly to the layer comprising the inorganic additive. Such a structure is seen in reference to Figure 2.